

82



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/757,759	01/09/2001	Ramakrishnan Srikant	ARC920010024US1	8061

28342 7590 01/12/2005

SAMUEL A. KASSATLY LAW OFFICE
20690 VIEW OAKS WAY
SAN JOSE, CA 95120

EXAMINER

HOLMES, MICHAEL B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2121

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/757,759	SRIKANT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael B. Holmes	2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE (3) MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Detailed Office Action</u> . |



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 – www.USPTO.GOV

Examiner's Detailed Office Action

1. This non-final Office Action is responsive to application 09/757,759, Amendment "A" under 37 CFR § 1.111, filed October 14, 2004.
2. Claims 1-39 have been examined.
3. Applicant has included the incorrect application serial number (09/780,812) on the prior response. Specifically, the claims and remarks. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Applicant's invention disclosed in claims 1-39 are directed to nonstatutory subject matter.

Claims 1-39 are considered to be an *abstract idea*. It is the examiner's position applicant's invention as claimed is not limited to a *practical application* in the technological arts. While, the claims *appear* to be directed towards a method and system performed on a computer.

Examination has revealed no computer or computer-readable medium has been disclosed by applicant.

Art Unit: 2121

6. This deficiency can lead to speculation that applicant's invention may be implemented on paper or by some other means not associated with a computing device. Examiner will not speculate as to the intended meaning, and will leave that to applicant to further clarify, since applicant discloses no "certain substances" that have been "transformed or reduced" that is, applicant claims disclose no *specific* computer or computer-readable medium.

7. Furthermore, there is no manipulation of *specific* data representing physical objects or activities constituting what one may classify as pre-computer activity, nor does applicant disclose any *specific* independent physical acts being performed by the invention constituting post-computer activity. As aforementioned, it is the examiner's position the claims as presented are nonstatutory, and merely manipulate *abstract ideas* in general without limitation to a practical application whereby "certain substances" are transformed or reduced on a computer or a computer-readable medium.

8. Therefore, claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 USC § 101.

9. It should be noted that if claims 1-39 were amended to recite a "computer," "computer-readable medium," or whatever word(s) or phrase(s) the specification uses for that feature of the computer the rejection under 35 USC § 101 would be withdrawn.

Conclusion

10. Office personnel are to give claims their "**broadest reasonable interpretation**" in light of the supporting disclosure. *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA

Art Unit: 2121

1969). See *also *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321-22, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322(Fed. Cir. 1989) (“During patent examination the pending claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. . . . The reason is simply that during patent prosecution when claims can be amended, ambiguities should be recognized, scope and breadth of language explored, and clarification imposed. . . . An essential purpose of patent examination is to fashion claims that are precise, clear, correct, and unambiguous. Only in this way can uncertainties of claim scope be removed, as much as possible, during the administrative process.”). *see* MPEP § 2106

Correspondence Information

11. Any inquires concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Michael B. Holmes**, who may be reached Monday through Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. EST. or via telephone at **(571) 272-3686** or facsimile transmission **(571) 273-3686** or email Michael.holmesb@uspto.gov.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful the **Examiner’s Supervisor**, **Anthony Knight**, may be reached at **(571) 272-3687**.



Michael B. Holmes

Patent Examiner
Artificial Intelligence
Art Unit 2121

United States Department of Commerce
Patent & Trademark Office

Thursday, January 06, 2005

MBH